DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 121 EA 013 142

AUTHOR Kussin, Laverne
TITLE The Effects of Proposition 13 on Employment, Salaries, and Fringe Benefits of Teaching Personnel in Riverside County.
INSTITUTION Riverside County Superintendent of Schools, Calif.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Class Size; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Problems; *Fringe Benefits; Promotion (Occupational); *Property Taxes; *School District Spending; School Funds; School Support; *School Taxes; State Aid; State School District Relationship; *Teacher Employment; Teacher Employment Benefits; *Teacher Salaries; Teaching Load
IDENTIFIERS Proposition 13 (California 1978); *Riverside County Schools CA; Tax Limitation Efforts

ABSTRACT

The appearance of Proposition 13, the Jarvis/Gann property tax limitation initiative, on the ballot in California in 1978 provoked legislators and educators alike to predict disastrous effects on education should the measure pass. Pass it did, and after the state went through a period of redistributing funds and the school districts reorganized their financing arrangements, things settled down. When a year had passed, the Riverside County superintendent of schools sent a questionnaire to the 28 districts in the county to determine the actual effects of Proposition 13 in the 1978-79 school year on the number of teachers employed and on the adjustments made to the salaries and fringe benefits of teachers. The questionnaire also asked what predictions could be made for 1979-80. The survey showed that Proposition 13 had had relatively negligible effects on class size, number of full-time teachers, number of teaching hours, salary increases, longevity pay, number of teaching days, or allotment of fringe benefits. Proposition 13 did cause the county's districts to lose 80 million dollars, which were essentially made up from state "bail-out" funds. Proposition 13 was predicted to have little effect on teacher employment during 1979-80, except for summer school. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196121

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EFFECTS OF PROPOSITION 13
ON
EMPLOYMENT, SALARIES, AND FRINGE BENEFITS
OF
TEACHING PERSONNEL IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY

EA 013 142

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. D. Kussin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OFFICE OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
May, 1979

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere thanks go to the school district personnel who took the time from their busy schedules to complete the questionnaire and a special thanks to Laverne Kussin, Employment, Compensation, and Training Officer, of our office, who designed and conducted this study.

DON F. KENNY

County Superintendent of Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... i

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... ii

LIST OF TABLES..... iv

CHAPTER

I. THE PROBLEM..... 1

A. Introduction..... 1
B. Statement of the Problem..... 2
C. Importance of the Problem..... 3
D. Delimitations of the Problem..... 4
E. Definition of Terms..... 4
F. Procedure..... 6
G. Organization of the Study..... 7

II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE, PUBLICATIONS, AND THE LAWS RELATING TO PROPOSITION 13 AND ITS EFFECT UPON THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS..... 8

A. Statutory Requirements..... 8
B. Background..... 9
C. Issues for Consideration..... 11
D. Summary of Chapter..... 12

III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA..... 14

A. Introduction..... 14
B. An Analysis of the Findings of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Employment for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County..... 15
C. An Analysis of the Findings of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Salaries for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County..... 17
D. An Analysis of the Findings of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Fringe Benefits for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County..... 19
E. An Analysis of the Findings of School District Predictions on Employment of Teaching Personnel in Fiscal Year 1979-80 over 1978-79..... 20
F. An Analysis of the Findings of School District Predictions on Salaries of Teaching Personnel in Fiscal Year 1979-80 over 1978-79..... 22
G. An Analysis of the Findings of School District Predictions on Fringe Benefits of Teaching Personnel in Fiscal Year 1979-80 over 1978-79. 23

IV. SUMMARY, SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 36

A. Summary..... 36
B. Restatement of the Problem..... 36
C. Procedure..... 36
D. Summary of Findings..... 37

1. General Findings from Research Materials... 37
2. Specific Findings from the Survey..... 37

E. Conclusions..... 42
F. Recommendations..... 43

APPENDIXES..... 45

A. Introductory Letter by Dr. Don F. Kenny..... 47
B. Narrative Letter and Quesionnaire..... 49
C. Legal Requirements..... 55

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 56

LIST OF TABLES

1. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE..... 24

2. ANALYSIS OF AVERAGE CLASS SIZE FOR 1977-78 AND 1978-79, RIVERSIDE COUNTY..... 25

3. ANALYSIS OF TEACHER EMPLOYMENT FOR 1977-78 AND 1978-79, RIVERSIDE COUNTY..... 28

4. ANALYSIS OF TEACHER SALARY DATA FOR 1977-78 AND 1978-79, RIVERSIDE COUNTY..... 30

5. ANALYSIS OF SABBATICAL LEAVE PROVISIONS IN 1977-78 AND 1978-79, RIVERSIDE COUNTY..... 32

6. ANALYSIS OF MEDICAL, DENTAL, VISION, AND OTHER INSURANCE IN 1977-78 AND 1978-79, RIVERSIDE COUNTY..... 33

7. PREDICTIONS ON CLASS SIZE, EMPLOYMENT OF TEACHING PERSONNEL, AND TEACHERS WORK DAY IN 1979-80..... 34

8. PREDICTIONS ON SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS OF TEACHING PERSONNEL IN 1979-80..... 35

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In the primary election held on June 6, 1978, the voters of the state of California overwhelmingly approved Proposition XIIIA, known as the Jarvis/Gann Property Tax Limitation Initiative. (Hereafter referred to as Proposition 13). Proposition 13 became a part of the Constitution of the state of California on July 1, 1978.

With the passage of this Initiative, the tax structure in the state of California was drastically changed. An abstract of the text of the Initiative follows:

> "Limits ad valorem taxes on real property to 1% of value except to pay indebtedness previously approved by voters. Establishes 1975-76 assessed valuation as base value of property for tax purposes. Limits annual increases in value. Provides for reassessment after sale, transfer, or construction. Requires 2/3 vote of Legislature to enact any change in state taxes designed to increase revenues. Prohibits imposition by state of new ad valorem, sales, or transaction taxes on real property. Authorizes specified local enities to impose special taxes except ad valorem, sales, and transaction taxes on real property." (Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee, p. 56).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to analyze the financial impact of Proposition 13 upon the employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel in the school districts of Riverside County. Specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the comparable number of teachers in school districts before and after Proposition 13?
2. What adjustments in salary of teaching personnel have school districts made as a result of Proposition 13?
3. What adjustments have school districts made in fringe benefits of teaching personnel as a result of Proposition 13?
4. What effects upon employment of teaching personnel are predicted for the 1979-80 fiscal year over 1978-79 as a result of Proposition 13?
5. What effects upon the salaries of teaching personnel are predicted in fiscal year 1979-80 over 1978-79 as a result of Proposition 13?
6. What effects upon fringe benefits of teaching personnel are predicted in fiscal year 1979-80 over 1978-79 as a result of Proposition 13?

Importance of the Problem

Prior to the passage of Proposition 13, there were dire predictions by opponents of the Initiative indicating that there would be disastrous effects to school districts if Proposition 13 passed. It was estimated that school districts in the state would lose between three and four billion dollars.

Leo McCarthy, Speaker of the House of Representatives, said the Initiative would destroy the schools. (Los Angeles Times, Dec., 1977). The California Teachers Association predicted the loss of 100,000 teachers necessitating more than doubling of class size. (Jarvis/Gann Tax Initiative, p. 2). They also predicted that special programs such as community services, meals for pupils, child development centers for handicapped pupils funded entirely by local taxes would be left with virtually no revenue. Other predictions included massive litigation, loss of local control of school districts, salary reductions, layoff of support personnel, school districts not able to pay their share of state teachers retirement funds, elimination of some community college courses as well as high school electives, and more headaches for principals. (Jarvis/Gann Tax Initiative; Los Angeles Times, March, 1978; California Federation of Teachers, p. 4-5).

Now that the Initiative has become a part of the legal

structure of the government of the state, no overall assessment has been made as to the effect upon employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel in Riverside County. It seems essential that such an analysis be conducted to determine what has been the effects.

Past records indicate that teaching personnel salaries have increased approximately five to eight percent each year in most districts in Riverside County. It is of interest to determine the effect of Proposition 13 upon these salaries.

Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited to the 28 public school districts in Riverside County and the Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools. The survey was further delimited by requesting only information which would provide data affecting employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel in the public schools of Riverside County.

Definition of Terms

The following is provided to better define terminology used in this study:

Teaching Personnel: Those employees who are required to hold a California Credential issued by the California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing to teach in a specific area or subject.

Teaching Hours: Hours a teacher is required to actually conduct classes.

Minimum Salary: The lowest salary on a salary schedule.

Maximum Salary: The highest salary on a salary schedule, excluding bonus provisions for longevity or other purposes.

Step Advancement: Experience increases. Most salary schedules in the public schools of California are constructed on a one to ten step salary schedule with the teacher advancing one step on the salary schedule per year.

Column Advancement: Preparation increases. Most salary schedules are constructed to pay additional salary for advanced course work, thus encouraging teachers to continue taking educational courses for advanced degrees.

Bargaining Table: The meeting of employees and employers or their designated representatives for purposes of negotiations. Senate Bill 160, the Rodda Act, enacted into law in 1975, mandated that public employers and public employees shall meet and negotiate matters within the scope of representation as defined. This bill became Section 3540 of the Government Code.

Negotiated Contract or Agreement: A collectively bargained contract or agreement between public employees and public employers under the Rodda Act.

Supreme Court Implementation: As a result of the passage of Proposition 13, the Governor and the State Legislature ruled that any public agency which desired to receive "bail-out funds" from the state to help offset the loss of revenue lost from the property tax, must freeze all salaries

and wages at the 1977-78 level. The Supreme Court ruled on February 15, 1979, that this was illegal and, therefore, public agencies that already had negotiated salary schedules for 1978-79 could implement them and those that did not have a negotiated contract could enter into negotiations for 1978-79.

Retroactive Pay: The action of the Supreme Court permitted public agencies to pay employees retroactively to July 1, 1978.

Sabbatical Leave: A governing board approved specified leave not to exceed one year for study and for travel. (Education Code Section 44966).

Holidays: Legal and local holidays mandated or permissible by Education Code Sections 37220 et al.).

Travel Reimbursement: Actual and necessary expenses of public school employees incurred where travel is required in the performance of the job.

Fringe Benefits: Public agency paid benefits for medical, dental, vision, life insurance, tax sheltered annuities, etc.

Longevity Pay: Additional stipend or step paid to employees for long term employment.

Procedure

On February 28, 1979, a narrative letter accompanied by a survey form was sent to the chief school administrator of each school district and community college district in Riverside County, directed to the attention of the personnel administrator/officer. The survey was sponsored by the

Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools and was approved by Dr. Don F. Kenny, County Superintendent of Schools. The cover letter from Dr. Kenny is included as Appendix A and the questionnaire and narrative letter are included as Appendix B.

Replies were requested by March 31, 1979. A telephone followup was made to those districts from which replies had not been received. Telephone followups were made as necessary. The net result was a one hundred percent return of the questionnaire.

Data from the questionnaire were tabulated and analyzed. The data are presented in Chapter III of this study.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduces the study, states the problem, explains the importance of the problem, delimitations of the study, defines terms, and outlines the procedure followed in the investigation.

Chapter II presents a review of the reference materials and the laws and regulations pertinent to the study.

Chapter III presents the findings and analysis of the survey.

Chapter IV summarizes the problem and procedure, cites the major findings of the study, presents the conclusions drawn from the findings, and offers recommendations based upon information gained.

The study is concluded with a bibliography and appendixes composed of reference materials pertinent to the study.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE, PUBLICATIONS, AND THE LAWS RELATING TO PROPOSITION 13 AND ITS EFFECT UPON THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Statutory Requirements

The California Constitution, Article IX, Section 1, declares that education is essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people. The state of California, under the provisions of Article IX, is responsible for maintaining a system of free, public, elementary and secondary schools for all children of the state.

Article XVI, Section 8, of the State Constitution, reads, "From all state revenues, there shall first be set apart the monies to be applied by the state for support of the public school system....." This statement would appear to insure funding of public schools under any circumstances; however, the article is written in general language and does not spell out how much money the state must apply in support of the public school system.

The Education Code of the state of California requires that school districts conduct their activities according to the rules and regulations contained therein. The Education Code provides for attendance and operations; budget and personnel; school programs and grounds; and other activities of public schools.

The California Government Code mandates that school districts must contribute to public employees' retirement systems and it also provides for employer-employee negotiations.

Under the provisions of the Education Code prior to the passage of Proposition 13, financing of public schools in the state was derived from three sources: (1) local property taxes; (2) state aid; and (3) federal funds. The breakdown was approximately 55% local taxes, 35% state aid, and 10% federal funds.

Background

On June 6, 1978, Proposition 13, known as the Jarvis/Gann Initiative, was passed overwhelmingly by the voters of the state of California and became operative July 1, 1978.

Proposition 13 was a tax limitation Initiative sponsored by the United Organization of Taxpayers and People's Advocate. A petition was circulated to the voters of the state and it qualified on the June, 1978, ballot with 1,260,000 signatures.

Proposition 13 was the third such attempt at imposing a constitutional limit on property taxes in the past 10 years. (Facts About Proposition 13 The Jarvis/Gann Initiative, Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee, p. 1). Despite some attempts to reduce the tax rate, property tax revenues throughout the state increased. The State Department of Finance estimated that property taxes in 1977-78 would exceed $11 billion, an increase of 9.6 percent. About half of that was

generated from all types of residential property tax. Out of each property tax dollar, 53 cents went to school districts. This amounted to a range of 20% to 90% reliance of school districts of the state upon the property taxes.

Voters who were opposed to Proposition 13 were predicting disaster for the public school system if Proposition 13 passed. Los Angeles Unified School District Teachers group predicted that as many as 18,000 teachers would be dismissed. A special report developed by the Bank of America predicted a loss of 3.6 billion dollars to the public school system if Proposition 13 passed. (A Special Report on Proposition 8 and 13, April, 1978).

A projected loss of local revenue to school districts in Riverside County including the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools was estimated to be approximately 80 million dollars. (Analysis of the Effects of Proposition 13 on School Districts in Riverside County, March, 1978).

An article entitled "Deceit on the Schools" appeared in the Los Angeles Times on May 7, 1978, estimating that the passage of Proposition 13 would deprive the public schools of 3.7 billion dollars. A headline in the September, 1978, issue of the Riverside County Schools Bulletin was entitled, "We Can Be Sure That The Road Ahead Will Lead to Austerity."

United Teachers-Los Angeles printed a leaflet entitled, "The Facts About Proposition 13" in which they indicated that the State Assembly Education Committee estimated a loss of

one third in support of revenue for public education in California. It further stated that a loss of that magnitude would force dramatically larger class sizes, elimination of school security services, and other programs such as school health services, summer school, and adult education programs.

Issues for Consideration

As a result of the passage of Proposition 13 and the resultant reduction of local taxes for support of the schools, the Governor and the State Legislature agreed to provide "bail-out funds" up to approximately 90 percent of the funds lost as a result of Proposition 13. Along with these funds came a restriction as to their use. Sections 16280 and 16280.5 were added to the Government Code by Chapters 292 and 332 Statutes 1978. The provisions of these added sections prohibited public entities from receiving the "bail-out funds" if they granted any pay increases not granted by the state to state employees. Since the Governor vetoed any raises for state employees, pay increases for public school employees were prevented, or the district would be penalized by the loss of the "bail-out funds."

Since many school districts already had negotiated salary schedules granting salary increases for teaching personnel for the 1978-79 fiscal year, employee organizations felt these contracts were binding. Therefore, many law suits were filed against the local districts and counties.

The California Supreme Court issued its ruling in the so called "bail-out fund" cases in the Sonoma County Organization of Public Employees v. County of Sonoma, et al., California Supreme Court No. SF2389, et al. The effect of the ruling was to nullify Sections 16280 and 16280.5 that were added to the Government Code. The Court held that these sections were unconstitutional as far as the "bail-out funds" were concerned, therefore, clearing the way for public agencies to grant salary increases retroactively.

Another aspect for consideration was the fact that most school districts, if not all, had dipped into their reserve funds to make up the loss of revenue between the local tax and the "bail-out funds", i.e., approximately ten percent. Therefore, most districts were financially pressed to identify funds available for salary increases.

Summary of Chapter

A review of the various materials used in this report together with laws and regulations relating to the operation of schools is summarized as follows:

1. Article IX, Section 1, of the California Constitution declares that education is essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people.
2. Article XVI, Section 8, of the California Constitution declares that money must be set apart to be applied by the state for

support of the public school system.

3. The California Education Code provides for: (a) Attendance and Operations. (Sections 37040, 46112, 46113, 46117, 48200, et al.); (b) Budget and Personnel. (Sections 22202, 22200, 35200, 42117, 43172, 44951, 44955, et al.); and (c) School Programs and Grounds. (Sections 35208, 49550, 51200-51262, 56500-56700, et al.)

4. Government Code Section 3540, Rodda Act, mandates employer/employee negotiations and Sections 16280 and 16280.5 froze wages and salaries at the 1977-78 level.

5. Supreme Court Ruling. The Supreme Court ruled on February 15, 1979, that Government Code Sections 16280 and 16280.5 were unconstitutional as far as the "bail-out funds" were concerned, thus permitting employee/employer negotiations to continue or to honor existing negotiated agreements.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

A questionnaire entitled "Effect of Proposition 13 on Employment, Salaries, and Fringe Benefits for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County" (Appendix B) was mailed to the 28 school districts in Riverside County and to the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools. The responses received are shown in Table 1. All of the 28 school districts and the County Superintendent of Schools responded to the questionnaire for a one hundred percent return.

All of the information contained in the questionnaire was completed by district personnel including President/Superintendents, Superintendents, Deputy Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Directors of Personnel, Business Managers, Administrative Assistants, Controllers, Personnel Technicians, and Executive Secretaries.

It was recognized that some of the questions contained in the questionnaire may not be applicable to all districts, therefore, the narrative letter (Appendix B) accompanying the questionnaire indicated that if all the information requested was not relevant to please indicate N/A (not applicable.) See Appendix A for introductory letter from Dr. Don F. Kenny, Riverside County Superintendent of Schools.

The material contained in this chapter reflects the data that were gathered by the questionnaire.

An Analysis of the Findings of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Employment for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County

The following results were obtained from the questionnaire relating to employment of teaching personnel in Riverside County:

Average Class Size: The average class size in the elementary districts for 1977-78 ranged from 24 to 30.6; high school districts ranged from 26 to 28.69; unified districts ranged from 23 to 36; and community college districts ranged from 14 to 29. The County Office responded N/A. In 1978-79 the average class size in the elementary districts ranged from 25.03 to 32.5; high school districts ranged from 25.61 to 28.5; unified districts ranged from 23.9 to 36; community college districts ranged from 13 to 29; and the County Office reported N/A. Only one unified school district and one community college district indicated that Proposition 13 had an effect on class size. The other 27 districts indicated that Proposition 13 had no effect. Results are shown in Table 2.

Number of Full Time Teachers: The data indicated that none of the eight elementary districts had fewer teachers in 1978-79 than in 1977-78. The same was true for the two high school districts. Three of the 14 unified school districts in Riverside County reduced the number of full time teachers from 1977-78 to 1978-79 but only one attributed the decrease

to Proposition 13.

It was interesting to note that all four of the community college districts had fewer full time teachers in 1978-79 than the previous year. Two stated that Proposition 13 was responsible for the decrease.

Of the 29 educational agencies in Riverside County, only three credited Proposition 13 with number of teacher reductions from 1977-78 to 1978-79. In fact, only seven of the school districts had fewer teachers while 19 of the educational agencies had more teachers and three had the same number of full time teachers for the two years.

The overall number of full time teachers in Riverside County for 1977-78 was 5,466 and 5,512 in 1978-79. This was an increase of 46 teachers. Results are shown in Table 3.

Number of Actual Teaching Hours Per Day: The data indicated that the number of actual teaching hours per day in the eight elementary districts ranged from 4.25 to 7 hours for both 1977-78 and 1978-79. The two high school districts ranged from 5 to 6 hours for both 1977-78 and 1978-79. The 14 unified school districts ranged from 4.5 to 7.5 hours for both years. Actual teaching hours was not applicable to all four community colleges and the County Office.

Of the 29 educational agencies in Riverside County, none indicated that Proposition 13 had an effect on the actual teaching hours.

An Analysis of the Findings of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Salaries for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County

Because of the Supreme Court ruling in February, 1979, indicating that salaries and fringe benefits could not be withheld from employees because of the "bail-out funds", the questionnaire was designed to accommodate conditions of salaries and fringe benefits before and after the ruling.

Salary Increases: Results from the survey indicated that none of the 29 school districts in Riverside County granted salary increases in 1978-79 prior to the Supreme Court ruling in February, 1979: therefore, salaries were frozen at the 1977-78 level. However, after the Supreme Court ruling, four elementary districts granted salary increases ranging from 4.9 to 8.5 percent over 1977-78 salaries, retroactive to July 1 or September 1, 1978. Four elementary districts are still in negotiations. One high school district granted an 8.5 percent increase over 1977-78, retroactive to July 1, 1978, and one high school district did not respond. Eight unified school districts granted salary increases. The increases in six of the districts ranged from 4 to 6 percent, retroactive to July 1, 1978 or December 1, 1978, while one district granted a $700 across the board increase, retroactive to July 1, 1978, and one district granted a $900 bonus, retroactive to July 1, 1978. Four unified districts are still in negotiations, one indicated not known, and one did not respond.

One community college district granted a 6.8 percent

salary increase for 1978-79, retroactive to July 1, 1978, one indicated they gave no increase, one indicated they were still in negotiations, and one indicated not known.

The Riverside County Superintendent of Schools granted a 4.7 percent increase for 1978-79, retroactive to July 1, 1978. Results are shown in Table 4.

Column and Step Advancement: The responses indicated that all 29 school districts granted column and step advancement at the beginning of the 1978-79 fiscal or school year, thus, indicating that Proposition 13 had no effect.

Longevity Pay: Out of the 29 responses regarding whether longevity pay was affected by Proposition 13, 16 school districts answered "no" and the other 13 did not have provisions for longevity pay. Therefore, Proposition 13 had no effect on longevity pay.

Extra Pay for Extra Duty: Responses to the question of whether extra pay for extra duty was affected as a result of Proposition 13, 19 answered "no", three answered "yes", six answered "N/A", and one answered "pay wasn't, but positions were."

Number of Teaching Days: The number of teaching days ranged from 175 to 181 in all 29 school districts for both 1977-78 and 1978-79. All 29 school districts indicated that Proposition 13 did not have an effect on the number of teaching days.

An Analysis of the Findings of the Effects of Proposition 13 on Fringe Benefits for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County

An analysis of the findings from the questionnaire on fringe benefits of teaching personnel in Riverside County are as follows:

Vacation and Sick Leave: Findings in this category indicated that none of the 29 school districts provided additional vacation or sick leave days to teachers in 1978-79 in lieu of salaries.

Sabbatical Leave: Only one of the 29 school districts indicated that Proposition 13 had an effect on sabbatical leave. Sixteen districts indicated that Proposition 13 had no effect, ten districts did not have provisions for sabbatical leave, and two districts did not respond. Results are shown in Table 5.

Holidays and Travel Reimbursement: All of the 29 school districts indicated that the number of holidays granted to teaching personnel in 1978-79 and travel reimbursement for actual and necessary job-related travel was not affected by Proposition 13.

Insurances: Twenty-eight of the school districts had district paid coverage for medical insurance ranging from $40.50 per month for employee only 100 percent coverage to $1,543 annual employee and family 100 percent coverage in 1977-78. One district did not respond. In 1978-79, 29 districts indicated they have district paid medical insurance coverage ranging from $40.15 per month for employee only 100

percent coverage to $1,604 annual for employee and family 100 percent coverage.

In 1977-78 fourteen districts indicated they had provisions for dental insurance while seventeen had provisions for dental insurance in 1978-79. One district indicated they were still in negotiations for 1978-79, and the other eleven districts did not have provisions for dental insurance.

Only four districts indicated they had provisions for vision insurance in 1977-78. The other 25 districts indicated they did not have provisions for vision insurance. There was no change in vision insurance coverage for the 1978-79 fiscal year.

Eleven districts indicated they have provisions for life, TSA, or other insurance coverage for both 1977-78 and 1978-79. The other 18 districts did not have provisions for life, TSA, or other insurance coverage.

Only two districts indicated that medical, dental, vision, and other insurances were affected as a result of Proposition 13 and that was a result of the "freeze" rather than lack of funds. Results are shown in Table 6.

An Analysis of the Findings of School District Predictions on Employment of Teaching Personnel in Fiscal Year 1979-80 over 1978-79

It was recognized that school districts might not have sufficient information at this time or would not want to predict what changes may occur in employment of teaching personnel in 1979-80. However, most of the 29 districts did

respond. Following is a summary of the findings from the questionnaire:

Class Size: Three elementary school districts do not anticipate a change in class size in 1979-80 while five predicted an increase in class size. One high school district predicted an increase in class size while the other predicted no change. Ten unified districts predicted no change in class size, two predicted an increase, and two did not know or did not comment. All four community college districts predicted no change in class size. The County Office predicted no change in class size. The totals were: Eight districts predicted an increase in class size, 19 predicted no change, and two did not respond. Results are shown in Table 7.

Number of Full Time Teachers: Three elementary districts predicted no change in the number of full time teachers in 1979-80 and five predicted an increase. One high school district predicted an increase in the number of full time teachers and one predicted no change. Five unified districts predicted a decrease in full time teachers, two predicted an increase, five predicted no change and two did not comment or did not know. Two community college districts predicted a decrease, one predicted an increase, and one predicted no change. The County Office predicted an increase in full time teachers. The totals were: Ten districts predicted an increase in full time teachers, seven predicted a decrease, ten predicted no change, and two did not respond or did not know. Results are shown in Table 7.

Number of Actual Teaching Hours Per Day: Seven of the elementary school districts predicted no change in the number of actual teaching hours per day in 1979-80 and one predicted an increase. Both high school districts predicted no change. Twelve unified districts predicted no change in teaching hours per day and two indicated they did not know. All four community college districts predicted no change. The County Office indicated no change in actual teaching hours per day. The totals were: One district predicted an increase, none predicted a decrease, 26 districts predicted no change, and two did not know or did not respond. Results are shown in Table 7.

An Analysis of the Findings of School District Predictions on Salaries of Teaching Personnel in Fiscal Year 1979-80 over 1978-79

School districts were more reluctant to predict changes in salaries in 1979-80 than any other item contained in the questionnaire. Following is a summary of the findings from the questionnaire:

Salaries: Nine districts predicted increases in salaries of teaching personnel in 1979-80. These predictions ranged from five percent to seven percent. Twenty districts did not respond. Results are shown in Table 8.

Number of Teaching Days: Twenty-six districts predicted no change in number of teaching days in 1979-80 over 1978-79. One district predicted a decrease, and two did not respond. The number of teaching days ranged from 175 to 181 in 1978-79 and no change was predicted for 1979-80. Results are shown in Table 8.

Longevity Pay: Twenty districts predicted no change in longevity pay in 1979-80, seven indicated N/A, and two did not comment. Results are shown in Table 8.

Travel Reimbursement: Twenty-seven districts predicted no change in travel reimbursement in 1979-80 and two did not comment. Results are shown in Table 8.

Summer School: Nineteen districts predicted that summer school will be decreased or eliminated, four predicted no change, four indicated N/A, and two did not comment. Results are shown in Table 8.

An Analysis of the Findings of School District Predictions on Fringe Benefits of Teaching Personnel in Fiscal Year 1979-80 over 1978-79

Findings from the questionnaire indicated very little change is anticipated in 1979-80 in fringe benefits. A summary of the findings follows:

Insurance Plans: Seventeen districts did not anticipate a change in district paid insurance plans, four predicted an increase, three predicted a decrease, and five did not comment. Results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE I

Responses to Questionnaire
School Districts of Riverside County, 1978-79

School District	Total Districts	Number of Responses Received	Percentage of Responses
Elementary	8	8	100
High	2	2	100
Unified	14	14	100
Community College	4	4	100
County Superintendent of Schools	1	1	100
Totals	29	29	100

TABLE 2

Analysis of Average Class Size for 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	Grade	Average Class Size 1977-78	Average Class Size 1978-79	Was Reduction Result of Proposition 13?
Elementary				
Elsinore Union	K-6	29	28	No
	7-8	29	29.5	No
Menifee	K-6	29	29	N/A
Murrieta	Did not respond			
Nuview Union	K-6	27.42	27.31	No
Perris	K-6	29.08	29.69	No
Romoland	K-3	29.9	25.03	No
	4-6	29.1	28.3	No
Temecula	K-6	24	26	No
	7-8	25	27	No
Val Verde	K-3	30.6	32.5	No
	4-6	27.8	31.6	No
High				
Elsinore Union	9-12	28	28.5	No
Perris	7 - 9	28.69	27.16	No
	10-12	26	25.61	No
Unified				
Alvord	K - 3	28	30	No
	4 - 8	29	29	No
	9-12	24	25	No
Banning	K - 6	28	30	No
	7 - 9	25	27	No
	10-12	23	25	No
Beaumont	K-12	30	30	No

TABLE 2

Analysis of Average Class Size for 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	Grade	Average Class Size 1977-78	Average Class Size 1978-79	Was Reduction Result of Proposition 13?
Unified (Cont'd.)				
Coachella	K - 4	28.5	28.6	No
	5 - 8	28.5	27.3	No
	9-12	27.7	27	No
Corona-Norco	K - 3	29.78	30.02	No
	4 - 6	31.5	31.5	No
	7 - 9	26.74	27.19	No
	10-12	29.66	28.09	No
Desert Center	K - 3	30	27	No
	4 - 5	30	31	No
	7 - 8	26	24	No
	9-12	27	33	No
Desert Sands	K - 1	33	33	Did not
	2 - 6	30	30	Respond
	7 - 8	26	26	
	9-12	25	25	
Hemet	K-12	28.1	30.1	Did not Respond
Jurupa	K - 3	32	32	No
	4 - 5	34	34	No
	6-12	36	36	No
Moreno	K - 6	27.75	29.5	No
	7 - 8	27.5	26	No
	9-12	24	24	No
Palm Springs	K - 6	24	25.37	Did not
	7 - 9	25	24.87	Respond
	10-12	26	26.10	
Palo Verde	K - 6	28.3	28	No
	7 - 8	32.5	31.2	No
	9-12	23.8	23.9	No

TABLE 2

Analysis of Average Class Size for 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	Grade	Average Class Size 1977-78	Average Class Size 1978-79	Was Reduction Result of Proposition 13?
Unified (Cont'd.)				
Riverside	K - 6	28.5	29	Yes
	7 - 8	29.8	30.3	Yes
	9-12	29.5	30.1	Yes
San Jacinto	K - 6	30	30	No
	7-12	28	28	No
Community College				
Coachella	13-14	31	29	Yes
Mt.San Jacinto	13-14	No Average Class Size		
Palo Verde	13-14	14	13	No
Riverside	13-14	29(Approx.)	29	No
County Office	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE 3

Analysis of Teacher Employment for 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	No. of Full Time Teachers FY77-78	78-79	Was Reduction Result of Proposition 13?
Elementary			
Elsinore Union	73	77	N/A
Menifee	9	10	N/A
Murrieta	11	11	N/A
Nuview Union	12	13	N/A
Perris	41	42	N/A
Romoland	10	12	N/A
Temecula	34	39	N/A
Val Verde	26	28	N/A
Sub-total (Elem.)	216	232	
High			
Elsinore Union	92	95	N/A
Perris	96	102	N/A
Sub-total (High)	188	197	
Unified			
Alvord	385	397	N/A
Banning	130	125	No
Beaumont	104	107	N/A
Coachella	266	267	N/A
Corona-Norco	733	709	No
Desert Center	40	42	N/A
Desert Sands	340	340	N/A
Hemet	320	342	N/A
Jurupa	303	305	N/A
Moreno	288	305	N/A
Palm Springs	347	354	N/A
Palo Verde	153	155	N/A
Riverside	1,023	1,001	Yes
San Jacinto	80	80	N/A
Sub-total (Unif.)	4,512	4,529	

TABLE 3

Analysis of Teacher Employment for 1977-78 and 1978-79

District	No. of Full Time Teachers FY77-78	78-79	Was Reduction Result of Proposition 13?
Community College			
Coachella	110	107	Yes
Mt. San Jacinto	44	40	Yes
Palo Verde	16	15	No
Riverside	198	194	No
Sub-total (Community Col.)	368	356	
County Office	182	198	N/A
TOTALS	5,466	5,512	

TABLE 4

Analysis of Teacher Salary Data for 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	Minimum Salary FY77-78	Maximum Salary FY77-78	Salary % of Increase FY78-79 over FY77-78	Increase Retroactive To What Date
Elementary				
Elsinore Un.	10,292	20,059	8.5	7/1/78
Menifee	10,355	20,184	4.9	9/1/78
Murrieta	10,679	19,923	Still in Negotiations	
Nuview Un.	10,152	19,097	6.0	9/1/78
Perris	9,903	19,807	5.0	7/1/78
Romoland	8,988	15,783	Still in Negotiations	
Temecula Un.	10,633	21,017	Still in Negotiations	
Val Verde	9,896	18,834	Still in Negotiations	
High				
Elsinore Un.	10,292	20,059	8.5	7/1/78
Perris Un.	10,747	20,092	No Response	
Unified				
Alvord	9,992	20,184	5.0	7/1/78
Banning	10,049	20,518	6.0	No Response
Beaumont	10,500	18,925	$700 across the board	7/1/78
Coachella	Split year Avg. 9,694	19,875	4.0	12/1/78
Corona-Norco	10,166	20,333	5.0	7/1/78
Desert Center	9,994	19,988	4.5	7/1/78
Desert Sands	9,969	20,050	$900 bonus	7/1/78
Hemet	9,988	19,975	Still in Negotiations	
Jurupa	10,355	20,704	7.0	7/1/78
Moreno	9,900	21,150	Not Known	
Palm Springs	10,507	21,033	Still in Negotiations	
Palo Verde	9,610	17,455	Still in Negotiations	
Riverside	10,020	20,509	Still in Negotiations	
San Jacinto	8,990	18,000	No Response	

TABLE 4

Analysis of Teacher Salary Data for 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	Minimum Salary FY77-78	Maximum Salary FY77-78	Salary % of Increase FY78-79 over FY77-78	Increase Retroactive To What Date
Community College				
			Equivalent to:	
Coachella	13,515	27,423	6.8	7/1/78
Mt. San Jacinto	13,406	25,483	0	
Palo Verde	10,550	21,992	Not Known	
Riverside	12,639	28,031	Still in Negotiations	
County Office	10,026	19,290	4.7	7/1/78

TABLE 5

Analysis of Sabbatical Leave Provisions in 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	FY77-78	FY78-79
Elementary		
Elsinore Union	6 mos. - 1 yr.	6 mos. - 1 yr.
Menifee	None	None
Murrieta	180 Days	180 Days
Nuview Union	No Response	
Perris	None	None
Romoland	None	None
Temecula	175 Days	175 Days
Val Verde	No Response	
High		
Elsinore Union	6 mos. - 1 yr.	6 mos. - 1 yr.
Perris	1 year	1 year
Unified		
Alvord	None	None
Banning	None	None
Beaumont	6 months	6 months
Coachella	1 year	1 year
Corona-Norco	6 mos. - 1 yr.	None*
Desert Center	1 year	1 year
Desert Sands	1 year	1 year
Hemet	181 Days	181 Days
Jurupa	None	None
Moreno	None	None
Palm Springs	1 year	1 year
Palo Verde	180 Days	180 Days
Riverside	Permissive	Permissive
San Jacinto	None	None
Community College		
Coachella	6 mos. - 1 yr.	6 mos. - 1 yr.
Mt. San Jacinto	Yes	No**
Palo Verde	No Response	
Riverside	1 year	1 year
County Office	None	None

* Result of Proposition 13
**Not a Result of Proposition 13

TABLE 6

Analysis of Medical, Dental, Vision, and Other Insurance in 1977-78 and 1978-79
Riverside County

District	PERCENT AND DOLLAR COVERAGE FOR INSURANCE Medical FY77-78	 FY-78-79	 Dental FY77-78	 FY'8-79	 Vision FY77-78	 FY78-79	 Other FY77-78	 FY78-79
Elementary								
Elsinore Union	F*100% $856	F 100% $900	Included in Medical		0	0	LDT & Life	LDT & Life
Menifee	No Re- sponse	E**100% $582	0	0	0	0	0	0
Murrieta	Cafeteria Plan for E. If dollar amount left, may use for F $1090		$1090					
Nuview	E 100% $765	E 100% $765	0	E only $149.10	0	0	0	0
Perris	Cafeteria Plan. May be used for dental and TSA $1078		$1078					
Romoland	E 100% $760	E 100% $760	0	0	0	0	If any left from medical may use	
Temecula	E 100% $665	E 100% $665	0	0	0	0	0	0
Val Verde	E 100% $40.50mo.	E 100% $40.15 mo.	E $15 mo.	E $15 mo.	0	0	TSA & Life	TSA & Life
High								
Elsinore Union	F 100% $856	F 100% $900	Included in Medical		0	0	LDT & Life	LDT & Life
Perris	F 100% $113.90m	F 100% $91.70mo.	E $13.63m	E $14.11m	0	0	TSA & Life	TSA & Life
Unified								
Alvord	E 100% $510.50	E 100% $568.70	0	E $144 yr.	0	0	0	0
Banning	May be used for any insurance including Family $1100		$1200					
Beaumont	Cafeteria Plan--not 100% coverage. $800 77-78, $1000 78-79							
Coachella	E not100% $552.10	In Negot.	No coverage for dental, vision, other in 77-78, still in negotiations for 78-79					
Corona-Norco	E not100% $630	E*** $1000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Desert Center	E 100% $93.61m	E 100% $60.60m	E $23.07m	E $23.88m	0	0	0	0
Desert Sands	F 100% $955.40	F 100% $955.40	F $24.25m	F $24.25m	$6 mo.	$6 mo.	0	0
Hemet	To be used as negotiated. $999 77-78 and $1125 78-79							
Jurupa	E 100% $850	E 100% $950	Inc. in Medical	Inc. in Medical	Vision if inc. in		TSA	TSA
Moreno	E&Fnot 100% $853.70	$853.70	E $276.90	E $276.90	0	0	0	0
Palm Springs	E$619.92 F$478.40	E$670.32 F$508.08	E $185.96	E $216.96	0	0	Life $125.56	Life $125.56
Palo Verde	Did not give $ amt. Indic. not 100%		E $73	E $143	0	F $110	0	0
Riverside	E 100% $900	E 100% $1100	Cafeteria Plan. Dental, life, and Income Protection covered					
San Jacinto	Fnot100% $896	F $1400***	0	0	E $23.50	E $23.50	0	0
Community College								
Coachella	F 100% $1022	F 100% $1281	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mt. San Jacinto	Cafeteria Plan to be used for medical, dental, TSA, or Life $110.60m	$116.51m.						
Palo Verde	F 100% $1543	F 100% $1604	F $593	F $593	F $63	F $73	0	0
Riverside	Cafeteria Plan F 100% $1796.80	$1796.80					TSA	TSA
County Office	F 100% $826	F 100% $826	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Family Coverage
** Employee Only Coverage
*** Result of Salary Freeze

TABLE 7

Predictions On Class Size, Employment of Teaching Personnel, and Teachers Work Day in 1979-80

Items	Type of District*	1979-80 Predictions			
		Increase	Decrease	Same	Not Known
Class Size	E	5		3	
	H	1		1	
	U	2		10	2
	CC			4	
	CO			1	
Totals		8		19	2
Full Time Teachers	E	5		3	
	H	1		1	
	U	2	5	5	2
	CC	1	2	1	
	CO	1			
Totals		10	7	10	2
Number of Actual Teaching Hours Per Day	E	1		7	
	H			2	
	U			12	2
	CC			4	
	CO			1	
Totals		1		26	2

N = 29

* E - Elementary
H - High School
U - Unified
CC - Community College
CO - County Supt. Office

TABLE 8

Predictions on Salaries and Fringe Benefits of Teaching Personnel in 1979-80

Items	Predictions for 1979-80				
	Increase	Decrease	No Change	No Response	N/A
Minimum Salaries	9 (5%-7%)			20	
Number of Teaching Days (175-181)		1	26	2	
Longevity Pay			20	2	7
Extra Pay for Extra Duty		9	15	2	3
Travel Reimbursement			27	2	
Summer or Extended Day School		19	4	2	4
District Paid Insurance	4	3	17	5	

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to analyze the effects of Proposition 13 on employment, salaries, and fringe benefits for teaching personnel in Riverside County. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the comparable number of teachers in school districts before and after Proposition 13?
2. What adjustments in salary of teaching personnel have school districts made as a result of Proposition 13?
3. What adjustments have school districts made in fringe benefits of teaching personnel as a result of Proposition 13?
4. What effects upon employment of teaching personnel are predicted for the 1979-80 fiscal year over 1978-79 as a result of Proposition 13?
5. What effects upon the salaries of teaching personnel are predicted in fiscal year 1979-80 over 1978-79 as a result of Proposition 13?
6. What effects upon fringe benefits of teaching personnel are predicted in fiscal year 1979-80 over 1978-79 as a result of Proposition 13?

Procedure

A review was made of various materials relating to the passage of Proposition 13. This involved the use of newspaper articles, publications of various agencies, and laws

and regulations relating to the operation of the public schools.

A questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter was distributed to all elementary, high, unified, community college school districts, and to the Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools. A 100 percent return was received from the survey from the 29 educational agencies in Riverside County.

The tabulation of specific questions represents approximately a 95 percent response since not all respondents completed all questions.

Summary of Findings

General Findings from Literature

The general findings in this study were obtained from the research materials used relating to the passage of Proposition 13. These findings were:

1. Predictions in loss of revenue to public schools in excess of three billion dollars.
2. Predictions of massive layoff of teachers and salary cuts.
3. Predictions of programs being cut.
4. Ruling by California Supreme Court removing salary "freeze" of public school employees.

Specific Findings from the Survey

An analysis of the data provided by the respondents to

the questionnaire yielded the following findings:

1. EMPLOYMENT

(a) Average Class Size: There was no appreciable change as a result of Proposition 13 in class size in 1978-79 over 1977-78. In 1977-78 the range for all districts was 14-36 and for 1978-79 it was 13-34. Of the 29 districts, only one unified district and one community college district indicated that Proposition 13 had an effect upon class size.

(b) Number of Full Time Teachers: The total number of full time teachers increased by 46 from 1977-78 to 1978-79.

Only one unified school district and two community college districts indicated that Proposition 13 was the cause of reduction in full time teachers.

None of the eight elementary school districts and none of the two high school districts had a reduction of teachers from 1977-78 to 1978-79.

Seven of the 29 educational agencies in Riverside County had fewer teachers in 1978-79 than in 1977-78. The other 22 agencies had the same or more teachers.

In general, Proposition 13 had little effect upon the number of full time teachers in the public schools of Riverside County. The negative impact of Proposition 13 was felt most at the community college level.

(c) Number of Actual Teaching Hours Per Day: Results from the questionnaire indicated that there was no effect from Proposition 13 on the actual teaching hours per day. The teaching day remained the same from 1977-78 to 1978-79.

2. SALARIES

(a) Column and Step Advancements: All 29 school districts granted column and step advances at the beginning of the 1978-79 fiscal or school year. There was no effect from Proposition 13.

(b) Longevity Pay: Twenty-nine districts responded to this particular item. Sixteen districts indicated that Proposition 13 had no effect; 13 did not have provisions for longevity pay; and the other two districts did not respond. The finding, therefore, was that Proposition 13 did not affect longevity pay in the school districts of Riverside County.

(c) Number of Teaching Days: There was no difference in the number of teaching days in 1978-79 over 1977-78. Proposition 13 did not affect this item.

3. FRINGE BENEFITS

(a) Additional Sick Leave or Vacation Days: None of the 29 school districts who responded provided additional sick leave or vacation days to teachers in 1978-79 in lieu of salaries. Therefore, Proposition 13 did not result in the school districts of Riverside County granting additional sick leave or vacation days in lieu of additional salary.

(b) Holidays and Travel Reimbursement: All districts responding indicated that there was no change in number of holidays and travel reimbursement in 1978-79 over 1977-78. Therefore, Proposition 13 did not affect this item.

(c) District Paid Insurances: Only one district indicated that Proposition 13 had an effect on district paid insurances. The other 28 educational agencies indicated that Proposition 13 had no effect upon insurance for teaching personnel in Riverside County.

4. PREDICTIONS IN EMPLOYMENT 1979-80

(a) Class Size: Eight school districts predicted an increase in class size, 19 predicted no change, and two did not know or did not comment.

(b) Number of Full Time Teachers: Ten districts predicted an increase in full time teachers, seven predicted a decrease, ten predicted no change, and two did not respond or did not know.

(c) Number of Actual Teaching Hours Per Day: One district predicted an increase in the number of actual teaching hours per day, no district predicted a decrease, ten predicted no change, and two did not respond or did not know.

5. PREDICTIONS IN SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS IN 1979-80

(a) Salaries: Nine districts predicted increases in salaries of teaching personnel in 1979-80 and twenty districts did not respond.

It is interesting to note that this particular item received the fewest responses.

(b) Number of Teaching Days: Twenty-six school districts predicted no change in the number of teaching days, one predicted a decrease,

and two did not respond.

(c) Longevity Pay: Twenty districts predicted no change in longevity pay, seven indicated N/A, and two did not respond.

(d) Travel Reimbursement: Twenty-seven school districts predicted no change in travel reimbursement and two did not respond.

(e) Summer School: Nineteen districts predicted summer school would be decreased or eliminated, four predicted no change, four indicated N/A, and two did not comment.

(f) Insurances: Seventeen districts did not anticipate a change in district paid insurances in 1979-80, four predicted an increase, three predicted a decrease, and five did not comment.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made:

1. The overall effects of Proposition 13 on employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel in Riverside County was negligible according to the findings in this study.

2. The study did confirm that the school districts in Riverside County including the Office of the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools did lose approximately 80 million dollars as a result of Proposition 13. However, because of the "bail-out funds" provided by the state, no significant effect was created on employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel in Riverside County.
3. Proposition 13 was predicted to have very little effect upon components of regular school such as class size, number of full time teachers, hours per teaching day, salaries of teachers, and fringe benefits. It was predicted to negatively affect summer school.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made:

1. In order for the schools to carry out the programs mandated by law, they need to know what kind of funds they can anticipate. Therefore, the State Legislature needs to pass and the Governor sign long-term financing provisions for the public schools rather than "stop gap" or temporary measures.
2. A study after three or more years of implementing Proposition 13 should be made to assess the effects on employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of

teaching personnel over a longer period of time.

3. A study of the effects of Proposition 13 on areas of public school operation other than employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel is recommended.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER BY DR. DON F. KENNY

OFFICE OF
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

February 28, 1979

TO: Chief School Administrator

FROM: Don F. Kenny

SUBJECT: Attached Questionnaire

As you know, our office seldom sends out questionnaires to local districts unless we are gathering information for use by the state. With this analysis we are trying to get a picture of the effects of Proposition 13 in Riverside County, and we will appreciate your taking the time to complete the attached questionnaire. Most of the questions will not require research and you will be able to answer them from just your knowledge of what has taken place in your district. We would like to have a 100% return.

Your assistance is appreciated.

DK:cae

Attachment

APPENDIX B

NARRATIVE LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

OFFICE OF
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

February 28, 1979

TO: Chief School Administrator

FROM: Laverne D. Kussin, Personnel Analyst

SUBJECT: Effect of Proposition 13 on Employment, Salaries, and Fringe Benefits for Teaching Personnel in Riverside County

ATTENTION: Personnel Administrator/Officer

Now that Proposition 13 has become a part of the legal structure of the state government, no overall assessment has been made as to the effect upon employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel in Riverside County. It seems essential that such an analysis be conducted to determine what has been the effects.

In order to determine this information, we have developed a questionnaire which will indicate changes made by your district in employment, salaries, and fringe benefits of teaching personnel in FY1978-79 over FY1977-78 as a result of Proposition 13.

Please complete each blank in the questionnaire. If you do not have the information available, or if it is not relevant to your district, please indicate N/A (Not Applicable).

Thank you for your assistance in completing this survey. If you should have any questions, please contact me at 787-6526. Results of this study will be forwarded to you upon completion if you so desire. Please indicate at the bottom of the questionnaire if you wish to receive a copy of the results.

Please return the attached questionnaire by March 31, 1979 to:

Laverne D. Kussin
Personnel Analyst
Office of Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
4015 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92502

LK:cae

Attachment

Approved:

Don F. Kenny
County Superintendent of Schools

OFFICE OF
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

EFFECT OF PROPOSITION 13 ON EMPLOYMENT, SALARIES, AND FRINGE BENEFITS
FOR TEACHING PERSONNEL IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY

Name of District_____

Prepared by:_____ Title_____

Phone No._____

A. Please indicate the changes in employment, salaries, and fringe benefits your district has made for teaching personnel as a result of Proposition 13.

		FY77-78	FY78-79
1. Employment			
a. Average class size:	K-3	_____	_____
	4-6	_____	_____
	K-6	_____	_____
(choose appropriate combination(s))	7-8	_____	_____
	7-9	_____	_____
	9-12	_____	_____
	10-12	_____	_____
	13-14	_____	_____
b. If there was a difference in class size, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____			
c. Number of full-time teachers (Do not use full-time equivalents):		_____	_____
If a reduction, was it a result of Prop. 13? Yes_____ No_____			
d. Number of actual teaching hours per day:			
	Elementary	_____	_____
	Jr. High/Intermediate	_____	_____
	Secondary	_____	_____
	Other	_____	_____
If a reduction, was it a result of Prop. 13? Yes_____ No_____			
2. Salaries			
PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS a THRU h PRE-SUPREME COURT IMPLEMENTATION			
a. Minimum annual salary (1st Step, 1st Col.):		_____	_____
b. Maximum annual salary (Last Step, Last Col.)		_____	_____
c. Was step advancement given?		Yes____ No____	Yes____ No____

	FY77-78	FY78-79
If no, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____		
d. Was column advancement given?	Yes____	Yes____
If no, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	No_____	No_____
e. If step and/or column advancement given, effective date:_____		
f. If step and column advancement given, was it arrived at via the bargaining table?	Yes____ No_____	Yes____ No_____

g. Was salary increase given in FY78-79?
Yes_____ No_____
If yes, what percent of increase:_____

h. Did district have negotiated salary schedule for FY78-79?
Yes_____ No_____
If yes, what percent of increase over FY77-78:_____

i. Was longevity pay given prior to Proposition 13?
Yes_____ No_____
If yes, was it reduced as a result of Prop. 13?
Yes_____ No_____

j. Was extra pay for extra duty given prior to Prop. 13?
Yes_____ No_____
If yes, was it reduced as a result of Prop. 13?
Yes_____ No_____

k. If salary increases are granted as a result of the recent Supreme Court ruling, indicate the effective date:_____

l. Number of days a teacher is required to be on duty:_____ _____
If increased or decreased, was it a result of Proposition 13?
Yes_____ No_____

3. Fringe Benefits

a. Did your district provide vacation days in lieu of salary increases for teaching personnel as a result of Proposition 13?
Yes_____ No_____If yes, how many days?_____

b. Did your district provide additional days of sick leave in lieu of salary increases as a result of Proposition 13?
Yes_____ No_____If yes, how many days?_____

		FY7 -78	FY78-79
c.	Does your district have provisions for sabbatical leave? If yes, number of days: If changed, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	_____	_____
d.	Number of holidays: If reduced, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	_____	_____
e.	Did district provide travel reimbursement prior to Proposition 13? If yes, was it reduced as a result of Prop. 13? Yes_____ No_____	Yes____ No_____	Yes____ No_____
f.	Dollar amount allowed for medical insurance (employee only): If increased or decreased, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	$_____	$_____
g.	Does this amount represent 100% coverage?	Yes____ No_____	Yes____ No_____
h.	Dollar amount allowed for medical insurance (family): If increased or decreased, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	$_____	$_____
i.	Does this amount represent 100% coverage?	Yes____ No_____	Yes____ No_____
j.	Dollar amount allowed for dental insurance (employee only): If increased or decreased, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	$_____	$_____
k.	Dollar amount allowed for dental insurance (family): If increased or decreased, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	$_____	$_____
l.	Dollar amount allowed for vision insurance (employee only) If increased or decreased, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	$_____	$_____
m.	Dollar amount allowed for vision insurance (family): If increased or decreased, was it a result of Proposition 13? Yes_____ No_____	$_____	$_____

n. Other (TSA, etc., explain)_____

B. It is realized at this point in time that you can only guess at the changes that may occur in employment, salaries, and fringe benefits your district plans to make for teaching personnel in FY79-80 over FY78-79, but we would like your best perceptions.

1. Employment

	Decrease	Same	Increase
a. Average class size:			
b. Number of full-time teachers:			
c. Number of actual teaching hours per day:			

2. Salaries

a. Minimum annual salary: Comments:_____

b. Maximum annual salary: Comments:_____

c. Do you anticipate reducing the number of days a teacher is required to be on duty?
Yes_____ No_____

d. Do you anticipate reducing longevity pay?
Yes_____ No_____

e. Do you anticipate changes in extra pay for extra duty?
Yes_____ No_____

f. Do you anticipate reducing travel reimbursement?
Yes_____ No_____

g. Do you anticipate any changes in construction of current salary schedule, i.e., less columns or steps?
Yes_____ No_____

h. Do you anticipate eliminating summer school o. extended day school?
Yes_____ No_____

i. Other

3. Fringe Benefits

a. Do you anticipate changes in number of sick leave days?
Yes_____ No_____

b. Do you anticipate reducing/increasing (circle one) number of holidays?
Yes_____ No_____

c. Do you anticipate increasing/decreasing (circle one) district-paid insurance plans?
Yes_____ No_____

d. Other

I would like to receive a copy of the results of this questionnaire. Yes_____ No_____

APPENDIX C

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

C O P Y

CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA

EDUCATION

Article IX, Section 1

A general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence being essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, the Legislature shall encourage by all suitable means the promotion of intellectual, scientific, moral, and agricultural improvement.

Article XVI, Section 8

From all state revenues there shall first be set apart the monies to be applied by the state for support of the public school system and public institutions of higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Administrative Code. Title 5. Education. California State Printing Office.

Alexander, K., Corns, R., McCann, W. Public School Law, Cases and Materials. St. Paul, Minn., West Publishing Co., 1969.

Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee: Facts About Proposition 13 The Jarvis/Gann Initiative. Sacramento, CA., February, 1978.

Bank of America. A Special Report on Proposition 8 and 13, April, 1978.

Best, J. W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

California Coalition for Fair School Finance: Fact Sheet: The Impact of Proposition 13 on Public Schools in California, April, 1978.

California Constitution. California State Printing Office.

California Education Code. St. Paul, Minn., West Publishing Co., 1978.

California Government Code. St. Paul, Minn., West Publishing Co., 1978.

California Federation of Teachers. California Teacher, Vol. 31, No. 5, Burbank, CA., March, 1978.

California Teachers Association: Fact Sheet Jarvis/Gann Tax Initiative. "Provisions of the Initiative." February, 1978.

Campbell, W. G. Form and Style of Thesis Writing. Boston, Mass., Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969.

Gillam, J. "Jarvis 1% Tax Initiative Called Potential Disaster." Los Angeles Times, December, 1977.

Hamilton, R. R., Reutter, Jr., E. Edmund. The Law of Public Education. Mineola, N.Y., The Foundation Press, Inc., 1976.

Lehmann, I. J., Mehrens, W. A. Educational Research, Readings in Focus. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Los Angeles Times: "True? False!." March, 1978.

National Organization on Legal Problems of Education. School Law Update--1977. Topeka, Kansas. Published Addresses from The 23rd Annual NOLPE Convention held in San Francisco, CA., November 9-11, 1977. Edited by M.A. McGhehey.

No on 13 Committee. "The Facts About Proposition 13." United Teachers-Los Angeles, 1978.

Office of Riverside County Superintendent of Schools: Analysis of the Effects of Proposition 13 on School Districts in Riverside County. March, 1978.

Riverside County Counsel: "Retroactive Pay Increases." February, 1979.

Turabian, K. L. A Manual for Writers. Chicago, University Press, 1973.

Walter, R. L. The Teacher and Collective Bargaining. Lincoln, Nebraska, Professional Educators Publications, 1975.

Weldy, G. R. Administering a Negotiated Contract. Reston, Virginia, National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1973.